G. R. S. 59]

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

1908.

(Mugrai)

File No. 584 – 08

Serial Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8
9. 10, 11. 12, & 13.

Papers Filed.

Month January 1911

SUBJECT.

Complaint of certain Brahamins Chitalorody redg the conversion by Murgi Matt of the public building in front of Sampege Siddeswara temple on the Chitalorody Hill into a Matt Building.

PREVIOUS REFERENCES.	LATER REFERENCES.
M. Kuhat Karanaffo Recorder	

G.R.S. 11] 1909.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(Mudgnar)

NOTES.

File No 586-08

FILL HEADING.

Petition from Gunda Bhatta and others of Chitaldrug complaining that the swamy of the Mwrage Math has unauthorizedly converted the public building in front of Sampage Siddeswara temple on the Chitaldrug Hill into a math and is trying to establish his right to it

From

Gunda Bhatta and others of Chitaldrug

~~No.~~ Petition Dated 22-4-09 Received

Diary No. 1401 } Enclos – Spare Copies – { Serial No /

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER.

NOTES AND ORDERS.

Dewan's order – "To, 2d Councillor with complts I would like to know the result of any enquiry which may be made"

Submitted with a draft as ordered, calling for report.

AV 30/4/09

250

529 30 4 09

Submitted to Sri [illegible]

[illegible]

NOTES—First sheet

AV 30/4/09

Note the Dewan's requ – 1/5/9

[illegible]

GPB—30,000 – 3 4 07

30/4/1909

Issue

[illegible] 31/5/1909

G. R. S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

Mysore File No. 584 of 1908

Serial No.

(2) To, The Dy Commr, Chitaldrug Distt
O. M. no 1870 Dt 11.5.09
Forwards Sl 1 for report
To, Gunda Bhatta and others of Chitaldrug
Endt no 1871 Dt 11 5 09
Intimates the above

(3) From, Hanumandappa and others,
Petition Dt 2:6:09
Pray for early enquiry into the matter.
This petition is also addressed to the Dewan and has been forwarded to the H. E. Councillor with the observation that there was a previous petition to the same effect

(4) From, The Dy Commr, Chitaldrug Distt
Letter no 81 Dt 17.8.09
Submits report called for in Sl 2.

(5) From, Lingappa, Agent of the Math
Petition Dt 24.8:09
Begs to apologise for his petition to the Dy Commr praying that the enquiry in the case should be conducted by a non-brahmin officer and requests that the records may be returned to that officer for complete enquiry and report to Govt with

Note—Contn. sheet.

GPB—50 000—15-5-08

G. R. S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

Mudz File No. 584 of 1908

Serial No.

his views

Submitted

AD 24.5.09

W 24/5/09 Ht 1

Under Secretary's note

The Dt Comr has taken offence at a petition presented by the Matt Agent to the effect that the enquiry should be held by a Non-Brahmin officer. This petition was presented to Mr Chengiah Chetty who directed Mr Dharmaraja Chetty to hold an enquiry. Mr Dharmaraja Chetty's report was recd by the offg Dt Comr Mr K Srinivasa Rao who says that he does not agree with Mr Dharmaraja Chetty. He adds that until the Matt withdraws the petition with an apology he will not deal with the case. The Matt Agent in his petition presented today says that he presented the petition objected to because it was said that the Acting Amildar Mr H Srinivasa Iyengar was favouring the opposite party, that he meant no offence to the offg Dt Comr ~~or any~~ and requests to be pardoned. The Agent requests that the records may be sent back with his petn to the Dt Comr and that officer asked to submit a detailed report with his opinion after perusing the records.

As the Brahmins have complained that

Slip B.

NOTE—Contn. sheet

GPB—50 000—13-5-08

G. R. S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

Mwrg File No. 584 of 1908

Serial No.

1742

all the witnesses have not been examined this case is not ripe for decision by govt.

Submitted to the Lieut Governor

[illegible]

24/8/1909

The papers may be returned for a final report with the D.C.'s opinion. The objection was not apparently meant to apply to the D.C. & need not have been noticed. The Agent's later petn may also be sent to the D.C.

[illegible]

25/8/09

Appointment - Postponement
[illegible]
26/8/1909

Issue
[illegible]
26/8/1909

Sd

6 To, the Dy Commr, Chitaldrug Distt.

Letter no 600 Dy 29-8-09

States that the objection raised by the Agent of the Mwrgi matt was not apparently meant to apply to the Dy. Commr and need not have been noticed and forwards the petition of the Agent requesting to be pardoned

Note—Contn. sheet.

GPB—50 000—13-5-08

G.R.S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

Mury File No. 584 of 1908

Serial No.

and calls for a final report with the Dy Commr's opinion

7. From, the Dy Commr, Chitaldurg Dtsth

Letter no 131 Dy 23-9-09

Submits his final report called for in Sl 6 together with the Records of enquiry.

The question for decision in this case is whether the Stone mantapa in front of Sampige Siddeswara Swamy temple on the Chitaldurg Hill is a Public Building as contested by Brahmins or a Building of the Muragi matt as contested by that matt

The former Assistant Commissioner Mr T Dharmaraja chetty's Kannada decision Dy 4/9th August 1909 and the present Assistant Commissioner Mr Mrutingier's English memo Dy 23d September 1909 go exhaustively into the facts of the case.

x Flag 3)

x Flag 4)

Mr Dharmaraja chetty who conducted the enquiry has examined a number of witnesses on both sides and the oral evidence thus recorded is either for or against the Muragi matt.

The documents produced by the Muragi matt are noted below.—

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—50 000—13-5-08

G. R. S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

Misc. File No. 586 of 190 8

	Serial No.	
× Flag P)		1) A certified copy of the Nirup (in Marathi characters) Dt 12th February 1827 said to have been granted by H H the late Maharaja Krishnaraja Wadiyar Bahadur III directing the Fouzdar to give the Swamy of the Murugi matt every help for the Navaratri celebrations in his matt on the Hills at Chitaldrug (the copy was granted by Genl. records on 1-10-08)
Flag O)		2) A certified copy of the letter Dt 10th May 1884 written by the Murugi matt to Palegar Lingana Naik according permission to cut and remove the "Bore" tree to the west of the matt on the Hills for purposes of fuel for his daughter's marriage
Flag N)		3) A certified copy of Dharkhast application Dt 14th May 1889 by Linganna Naik to the Taluk office enclosing the original of the above communication and praying for a free License to cut down the "Bore" tree
× Flag M,)		4) Do of Panchayet Maharzar Dt 18th May 1889 stating that the "Bore" tree in question belongs to the Murugi matt.
× Flag L,)		5) The Amildar's original order Dt 20th May 1889 permitting Lingappa Naik to cut the said tree.
× Flag K,)		6) A certified extract from the Taluk petition Register of a petition Dt 4th April 1890

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—55,000—27-1-09

Serial No.

presented by Parpathegar Lingappa of the Muragi matt representing that the Sampige Tree within the compound of the matt on the Hills belonged to the Muragi matt, that the flowers of the tree were being used for Puje in the matt and Gaddige and requesting that the Tree should be excluded from the Amarayi sale by the Taluk.

× Flag (I) 7) Special Khaneshmari accounts of 1904-5 wherein the building in question is noted as మురగిమఠ- మురగిరాజుతదలవ్యవిగేమఠ- మువ్వినస్తంభగళమఠ.

8) Gazetteers of Mr. Rice wherein the building is shown as belonging to Muragi matt.

9) General Khaneshmari of the year 1901 wherein the mantapa is noted as మురగిమఠగిలు.

The Brahmin petitioners have produced no documentary evidence in this case.

× Flag (V2) The Local Officers including the Offg. Dy. commr. Mr. K. Srinivasa Rau are of opinion that the mantapa is the property of the Muragi matt and that the Gaddige therein is not of recent origin but an old structure.

Flag The Complaint of the Brahmin pet

Serial No.

is that a number of other respectable witnesses - some of whom are retired Govt officers - have not been examined. They pray for a perusal of the under-mentioned documents. —

1) Records showing that the flowers of the "Sampige" tree within the precincts of the Stone mantappa were being previously sold and credited to Amarayi funds,

2) Order of Major Dobbs of the year 1835 in evidence of the fact that the Muragi Swamy had not been entering into Chitaldrug town for a number of years past,

3) Old Jamabandy Ghoswari and Kadeband accounts of the previous years available in the District office, and

4) The History of Chitaldrug written about the year 1867-8 under orders of the late Chief Commr by the then Dy Commr Mr P. Krishna Rau.

Three petitions have since been received - one* to this office by Brahmins and the other two by Hanumappa and several other ryots of Annehall, Mahadevanakatte and other Villages, addressed

* Flag V,)

Note—Contn sheet.

G. R. S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

Murg File No. 886 of 1908

Serial No.

to the Dewan and this office

Hanumappa and others state in their petitions as follows —

Flag

1) The Stone building under dispute was the public property till very recently and every one had access to it. There was no Gaddige in it formerly. The oral evidence adduced by Pujaries in this connection is conflicting in certain respects.

2) In the Pallegar's History of Chitaldrug, the building is noted as Siddeswara charadi

3) A separate Murgi matt had existed on the Hills on the Vacant site (which could now be seen) and as it fell into ruins, it was shifted to the town. The absence of Linga Mudre Stone in the Building shows that it cannot be a matha as alleged.

4) There is a already a Gaddige in the Murgi matt. There is no truth in the statement that a Gaddige has been in existence in the Stone building. Enquiry may kindly be made of the Murugi matt

5) In spite of their request the enquiry was not completed. The Offg Dy Commr who has been in the Distt for a few months cannot be expected to give an opinion in the matter. The permanent

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—55,0 0—27-4 0r

G. R. S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

Misc File No. [illegible] of 190

Serial No.

Dy. Commr. Mr. Chengiah Chetty whose experience of the Distt. extends over a period of 25 years may also with advantage, be consulted.

6) They have refs. to show that their Guru had occupied the Stone building for some time during the (Birthday) celebrations of the Emperor of India.

They pray that they may be heard by Govt. before final orders are passed

Submitted for orders

[illegible] 10:09

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—55,0[illegible]—27-4-0[illegible]

[illegible]

that [illegible] the

Hill [illegible]

[illegible]

Submitted.

The Dy Commr's report has been received on the 25th Instant. The case is being worked up. Two Petitions were received today. The case will be submitted to the Under Secretary before tomorrow

30/9/09

Submitted to Secd Committee

[illegible]

30/9/1909

The Petrs say that the Mathe of Lingayatas was separate; that the name of this is [illegible], but that it was never known as [illegible]; that they have recently improvised a [illegible] in it & that they usurped it after getting D.C.'s permission for staying 3 days. There is said to be no [illegible] in the building as shd be expected.

It is said that some Sadars have ~~applied~~ petitioned against this ~~[illegible]~~ usurpation. The Petrs complain that their witnesses were all not examined by Mr. Dharmaraya Sattu.

P.T.O.

N. B.—Should routine notes be written on small slips, the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on this form

Let the case be submitted in usual course.

[illegible]

30/9/09 30/9/09

GPB—15,000—19-5-08

Subd

This will be placed in the File & Subd

AV

[illegible] on the case

Two years ago, the Patel sent a report against the Mathe men repairing the building, as it was a Govt one.

20/9/9

Serial No.

Note by the under Secretary:—

The representations made by the Brahmans to the Second Councillor have been summarized thus on the previous page:—

(1) The Matha of the Lingayets was separate.

(2). The building in dispute is known as [illegible] or [illegible] and was never known as Matha

(3). The Gaddige was recently put up

(4) There are no [illegible] in this building,

(5). That all the witnesses for Brahmans were not examined.

(6). That the Patel sent a report two years ago against the Matha when the Matha people repaired this building.

I shall first deal with (5). The Brahmans cited 24 witnesses. The undermentioned 4 gentlemen being retired State Officers, notice was not issued to them:—

1. Mr. Tirumalachar, Retired District Judge.
2. " C. Srinivasangar, Retired Member of Council.
3. " M. S. Narain Rao, Retired Deputy Comr.
4. " Ramanujangar, —— do ——

Notice was issued to the remaining 20 witnesses but was personally served on 17 of them

NOTE.—Contn. sheet.

GPB—55,000—27-4-09

G. R. S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

Misc File No. 584 of 1908

Serial No.

Pleaders Narasingappa and Lakshminaranappa and Pensioned Judicial Head Munshi Alasingrachar being absent from the place

of the 17 witnesses who were served only 8 were present on the date of hearing and were examined These are —

1 Pavagada Bheemasena Rao, Retired Amildar.
2 Pleader Vendantiengar
3 Bank Agent Raghvendra Rao
4 Vakil Govinda Rao
5 Pennikonda Krishnachar.
6 Venkatramana Vadhani, Purohit
7 Murti Rao Retired Excise Inspector
8 Hanumantappa, Retired Head Shroff.

The name of the remaining nine are noted below.—

1 Swamyarayachar, Jodidar
2 Venkappa Deekshit
3 Krishnappa.
4 Shanbhogue Gurumurtiappa
5 Kande Rao.
6 Pensioned Dy Munshi Desikachar
7 Head Gumasta Venkatakrishnappa.
8 Subrahmanya Sastri, Sanskrit Munshi.
9 Pensioned Sherustedar Subbanna.

If in this case the burden of proof were on the Brahmans, the non-examination of witnesses

NOTE—Contn sheet.

GPB—55,000—27-4 09

Serial No.

might affect them It is however clear, that the burden of proof is on the Math The Brahmans had only to adduce rebutting evidence The non-examination of some witnesses cannot be a serious matter unless these witnesses had to speak of important matters specially within their knowledge I do not think such is the case, and most of the witnesses examined for the Brahmans are respectable men. Not one of these has said that the Math building on the hill was separate They have all in one voice said that the building in dispute is known as Mungi Math. Having been in Chitaldrug, I know also that the building went by the name of Mungi Math. As the local 1st class magistrate, I was present when a breach of the peace was apprehended on the occasion

* Flag R) referred to in the Amildar's report No. 357 D/24-2-1902 which refers to the Mungi Math building on the

Flag A) Hill. The Patel's report alluded to in the 6th representation refers to this building as Mungi Math

I can safely say that representations (1) & (2) are false.

As regards the Gaddige, the witnesses for the Math say that this has been in existence from a long

Flag Y. Page 29) time. As Mr. Mrityunjaya Iyer says, the very position of the room in which the Gaddige now is, shows that the room was intended for a Gaddige. It would be reasonable to say that the Gaddige referred to

G. R. S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

Mung File No. 584 of 1908

Serial No.

of the witnesses examined for the math, only the 22nd and 25th and the batch of witnesses marked as 24th speak about this. Except the 22nd I do not think the other witnesses can be said to be disinterested. A Khaneshumari extract has also been produced wherein this Upparige ~~building~~ has been referred to as belonging to the math. This is of the year 1904-5.

(Hug II)

Submitted to the Dewan through the Second Councillor. [signature]

27/11/1907

Before going further, ask the Dy Cr to send up a proper sketch of the Temple & the buildings in dispute together in full — drawn to scale. Is the so called Gopura connected with the Compound wall of either the temple or the 'Murgi mathe' by any compound wall touching it

Who worships the idol in Siddeswara temple? Has he

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—55,000—27-4-09

G. R. S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

Mudy File No. 584 of 1908

Serial No.

been examined as a witness? If so, mark his deposition.

Has the Murigi Swami any interest in this temple. If the latter instn is independent, is any claim set up on its behalf for the building in dispute?

4/12/9

The Dy Cr may be asked to express his opinion about the 'Gopura' building separately with reasons (if it is a detached structure) whether it is a part of the temple or of the Mathra.

4/12

4/12

Venkatachar Pratap Supt
7/12/1909

Dft Submtd
7-2-09

Issue
7/12/1909

Note—Contn sheet.

GPB—55,000—27-4-09

G. R. S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

Muz File No. 584 of 1908

Serial No.

8 From, Gopala Bhatta and other Brahmin residents of Chitaldrug
Petition dated 30th Septr 1909
Pray that the permanent Dy Commr may also be consulted in the matter

9 To, the Dy Commr, Chitaldrug Distt
Letter no 1426 Dy 8th Dec 1909
Calls for inform on the queries raised by the Councillor in pages 17 and 18 of the office-note

10 From, the same officer,
Letter no 367 Dy 30 3 1910
Submits report with records
The Dy Commr's report is exhaustive The several queries and answers are given in juxta-position.
A sketch showing the temple and the buildings in dispute is submitted.
The Pujari of Siddeswara Devaru was examined by the Dy Commr on 6th Feby last. His deposition is marked. He states that Pujaruke is hereditary in his family, that the upper ad- near the Mahadwara of the temple belongs to the instn and that the stone mantap under dispute as well as

× 7 (ag 5)

NOTE—Contn sheet.

GPB—55,000—27-4-09

G. R. S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

Muz File No. 564 of 1908

Serial No.

The upparige near nyyale pillars facing the Siddeswara Devaru temple belong to Muragi matt

(Paper under disposal)

The Dy Commr reports that he inspected the building in dispute and feels satisfied that the tree in question is situated within the precincts of the matt. His opinion with regard to Gopura is that it does not form parts of the temple nor does it belong to Murage matt. Submitted for orders

AS 7.4.10 Ug 7.4.10

The Dy Comr - for this report with a sketch has been received.

It appears to me necessary to explain this sketch

The building claimed by the Matt is the one portions of which have been marked with the figures 9, 26, 27 and 28 The whole building is claimed. 26 is apparently the j addiga.

~~Muz~~ The group of buildings on the other side of the wall marked in pencil as temple Wall by the Dy Comr is known as the Sanpiga Siddeswara Temple.

To the queries of the Second Councillor I added one

NOTE—Contn sheet

GPB—55,000—27-4 09

G. R. S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

Mutty File No. 584 of 1908

Serial No.

about the Sampige tree (portion of No. 13 in the Sketch)

The Dy. Comr. is reply shews that though the Matt ~~at~~ claimed this as there is 1590 nothing was done beyond calling for a part from Unthanking a & that even now the tree is included in the Anuraya list

The Dy. Comr. is of opinion that the Gopura or Uppaigi No 6 belongs neither to the Matt nor the temple.

3277. 486 Submitted to Second Commission [illegible]

11/4/1910

There is no doubt that the building in dispute belongs to the Murigi Matha. The Gopura (No 6) does not form part of it and should be declared to be the property of Govt. It may for purposes of convenience be ~~regarded~~ tacked on to the Siddesvara temple. Please draft an order & issue after approval by the Dewan.

(Let me see the draft first

Portion draft 15/4/10
17/4/1910

[signature]

NOTE—Contn sheet.

GPB—55,000—27-1-09

G. R. S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

Mus File No. 584 of 1908

Serial No.

5° 4

Submitted with a draft to Second Councillor

AV 25-4-10

[illegible] 26/4/10

Ahmadu [illegible]

26/4/1910

Draft approved –

26/4/10

[illegible]

5836 / 28-4-10

130 Draft submitted to Dewan

Ahmadu [illegible]

28.4.1910

I have made a few alterations mostly verbal which I trust will commend themselves to the Second Councillor – If approved by the 2d Councillor also, the draft as now altered may issue

[illegible] 4 AUG 10

[illegible]

Submitted to Second Councillor

Ahmadu [illegible]

5 11 1910

The ~~[illegible]~~ draft as modified by the Dewan may issue –

Issue 87 11/11/1910 9/11/10

[illegible]

NOTE—Contn sheet.

GPB—55,000—27-4-08

G. R. S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 584 of 1908

Serial No.

11 To, the Dy Commr, Chitaldrug Distt

G.O. no 1322 Dy 19. 11. 1910

upholds the finding of the Local officers that the building in dispute belongs to Muragi matha and direct that the Gopura or upparige refd to in Patel's report, should be treated as Govt property.

12 From, the Dy Commr, Chitaldrug Distt

Letter no. 230 Dy 15 12 1910

Requests the return of the Vernacular records.

Submitted for orders

BK 1323 23 12. 1910 Sd/ Submitted to Secd Councillor

There does not appear to be any objection to the return of the Vernacular papers. Most parties of the direction referring to the return of the records has been scored out and so the records have not been returned.

Chitaldrug

13/12/1910

The Papers may be sent back.

Issue 29/12/10 8/1/1911

Return 8/1/1911

Dft Submitted.

3/1/11

376

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—50,000—12 8 10

G. R. S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 584 of 1908

Serial No.	
13	To The Dy Comr Chitaldroog Dist No 1750 of 7 1 1911 Returns the Ven Records re relating to the Stone building near Sampege Siddeswara Swami temple on the Chitaldroog Hill

NOTE—Contn sheet.

GPB—50,000—12 8 10

1909. Bilect

No. 96	Mazr F 584-08-
Name of Petitioner,	Gunda Bhatt and others
Village,	of Chittledroog
Taluk,	Chittledroog
District,	do
Date of Arzi,	22d April 09
Date of Receipt,	23d do
Date of disposal,	
No. of Enclosure,	"

To 2d Councillor
With Compts

I wd like to know the result of any inquiry which may be made

[illegible]
[illegible]

Put up a note & cover for enquiry & detailed report
[illegible] 27 4 09
[illegible]
27/4/09

ABSTRACT

Petitioners say that there is a building valued a about 50 or 6000 Rs in front of the Sampagi Siddeswara temple on the Chittledroog hill which, from hundreds of years is being used by the general public for feeding and other purp

bout the early part
of this month the
Swami of the Murgi
natt took permis-
sion to occupy the
aid building for 3 days -
ie his stay there
Swami has un-
authorizedly got a
addige raised and
also employed some of
his own men to conduct
worship &c - thereby
trying to establish
his exclusive owner-
ship -

Petitioners pray
that this may be
prevented and that
the original arrange-
be restored -

24. 4. 09.

3

Muz.3]

GOVT. OF H. H. THE MAHARAJA
OF MYSORE.

MUZRAI DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

No. 1870/884-08-2 and one

The accompanying Petition No. D. 1401

dated 22-4-09 received at this Office from Gunda Bhatta and others of Chitaldrug complaining that the Swamy of the Murgi Matt has unauthorized converted the public building in front of ~~Sampagi~~ Sampige Siddesh temple on the Chitaldrug Hill ~~is forwarded, together with~~ its ~~enclosures, to the~~ into a matt and is trying to establish his right to it, is forwarded to the Dy. Commr, Chitaldrug Distt, for favor of enquiry and detailed report at an early date

By Order,

BANGALORE, 190.

Secretary,
~~Muzrai~~ Department.

GP —1500—20 10 07

30/4

1871 ಗ 11-5-09

D1768

Recd 5-84-08-3

Encroachment
in Hamlets

(There was a previous petn to same effect)

[signature]
16 June 09

BV VII

[signature]
9/6

[signature] 19/6

[signature]
Refer cars
[signature]
19.6.09

1909.

No.	365
Name of Petitioner,	Hanumappa & others
Village,	Godabanahall, Annéhall, Mahadevankatte &c
Taluk,	Chitaldurg
District,	Chitaldurg
Date of Arzi,	"
Date of Receipt,	2d June 09
Date of Disposal,	
No. of Enclosure,	nil - No Stamp.

ABSTRACT

State that there is a Stone mantap in front of the Sampege Siddeswara swami temple on the Chitaldurg hill, & that they ~~were~~ are in the habit of using it, since their elders time, for cooking & other purposes whenever they go to offer their worship to the deity, but that of late the Murge Matt authorities have ~~placed their peons to~~ ~~who~~ taken the said mantaps ~~management~~ into their possession ~~lands~~ and allow no one to occupy it So they pray that an enquiry may be made into and that the Mantap left free for the use of the Baktadees.

[signature] 7/6/09

GPB—500—17-5-09

Recd by registered post
2.5.07.

D/1768

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[redacted]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

Mwz F 584-08-3
1909
D 402 -4

Fm ~~Mwz F 65-08-11~~

The Deputy Commissioner
Chitalong District

To

The Secretary to the Govt
of H H the Maharaja of Mysore
Mizrae Branch
Bangalore

Dated 17th
Despatched 19th
Received } Aug 1909

General No E

Sec No

Reporting on the petition of Gunda Bhatta and others of Chitalong complaining that the Swamy of the Mungi Matt has unauthorised Converted some public building into a matt & is trying to establish his right to it.

Refer
A.G. continue note early
[illegible]
[illegible] 1909

881 / Mc i file

Office of the Deputy Commissioner
Chitaldrug District
Dated, Chitaldrug, 17 August '09

From

K. Srinivasa Rao, Esquire,
Offg. Deputy Commissioner
Chitaldrug District

To K. S. Chandrasekhara Aiyar, Esquire, B.A.B.L.
Secretary to the Government of His Highness
the Maharaja of Mysore
Mirzai Branch
Bangalore.

Sir,

With reference to your No. 2474 / Mrs 3584-08 dated 30th June '09 calling for a report on the petition of Gundabhatta and others of Chitaldrug, complaining that the Swami of the Mungi Matt has unauthorizedly converted some public building into a matt and is trying to establish his right to it, I have the honor to forward the records of enquiry conducted by Mr. Dharmaraja Chetty. I do not agree with Mr. Dharmaraj Chetty in his conclusions. A petition has been tained by the Deputy Commissioner

(Flag A)

(Flag A) from the Matt agent that the enquiry into the case should be conducted by a non-Brahmin Officer. Unless, this petition is unconditionally withdrawn with an apology, I am reluctant to take any action and I have, therefore, left the papers for the disposal of Mr. M. Chengiah Chetty. I may also mention that the matt is reported to have taken advantage of the permission given by the Deputy Commissioner to occupy the mantapam for a few days to enclose and lock up a portion of it.

2 The records may kindly be returned when done with.

I have the honor to be

Sir,

Your most Obedient Servant

[signature]

Offg. Deputy Commissioner

Chitaloong District

P.O.

[G.R.S. 26]

File No. 584-08

Serial No

Diary No. of letter replied to _____

No. 600 encl 1 & 1 file.

Murg-F. 584-08-6

General and Rev. Secretariat

( )

, the 190 .

To

The Offg Deputy Commr.

Chitaldrug Dt

Date of issue 24th August 1909

Signed by Mr. A. S. Myers.

Sir

With reference to your letter No. 81 dated 17th August 1909, taking exception to the petition of the Murge Matt Agent in the matter of holding an enquiry into the alleged unauthorized conversion of a public building on the Chitaldrug Hill into ~~on~~ a private one by the Swami of that Matt I am directed to state that the objection raised by the Agent was not apparently meant to apply to the Dy Commr and ~~not~~ need not have been noticed. The Agent has ~~also~~ presented a petition to this Office stating that he meant no offence to the ~~[illegible]~~ Deputy Commr

over.

SUBJECT.

tion, and

requesting to be pardoned In ~~these in~~ forwarding

that petition no. D 419 dated 24th
Muz 584-08-4

August 1909, and also all the records

received with ~~your~~ the letter under reply

~~are forwarded herewith, and~~ I am

to request to be furnished with a final

report together with your opinion on

the subject at an early date

I am ...

[illegible]
26/8/1909

For Secretary

List of enclosures,

Copied by

Examined by

MGCPB—20,000-19-12—04

D 621

Thur F 584-08-7

190 7

From

The Deputy Commissioner
Chitaldrug District

To

The Secretary to the Government
of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore
Mugrai Branch,
Bangalore

Dated 23rd

Despatched September '09

Received

General No. 1

No.

Enclosure No. 1 report and 1 file 18

Submitting a final report on the alleged unauthorized conversion of a public building on the Chitaldrug Hill into a private one, by the Swami of the Mungi Math.

XX
Refer card

AV continue note
[illegible]

[illegible] 20/09

GPB—2,00,000—12-4 09

No 131
Sue 1 report
File V.P.

Deputy Commissioner's office,

Chitaldrug District.

Dated, Chitaldrug, 23rd September 1909.

From

K.Srinivasa Rao, Esquire,

Offg. Deputy Commissioner,

Chitaldrug District.

To

K.S.Chendrasekhara Iyer, Esquire, B.A., B.L.,

Secretary to the Government of

His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,

Muzrai Department,

B A N G A L O R E.

Sir,

With reference to your letter No.600/Muz.F.584-08-4 dated 27th August 1909 requesting to be furnished with a final report on the alleged unauthorized conversion of a public building on the Chitaldrug Hill into a private one by the Swamy of the Murgi Matt, I have the honorto state that, in company with the Sub-Division Officer, Chitaldrug, Mr.Mrityanjaya Iyer, I inspected the building on 21st Instant.Thereupon, referred the file to the latter for an expression of his opinion.

2. I append in original the exhaustive and informing te drawn up by Mr.Mrityanjaya Iyer on the subject matter of the

3.

3. The reasons assigned by Mr.Mrityanjaya Iyer to show that the structure is not a public building and that it is the exclusive property of the Murgi Matt and that the Gaddige in it is not a new installation are so cogent and convincing that I have no hesitation in recording my unqualified concurrence therein.

4. After a careful perusal of the records in the light of the concurrent findings of both Mr.Dharmaraj Chetty and Mr.Mrityanjaya Iyer, I hold it as my opinion that the structure is the exclusive property of the Murgi Matt and that the Gaddige in it which I noticed at my inspection is not one newly installed for the purposes of this dispute by the Murgi Matt or its disciples but has existed there as evidenced by Government records long before 1890, that is, about 19 years before this dispute cropped up.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

Offg. Deputy Commissioner,

Chitaldrug District.

Refer AY
Culture Note
37
30/1/[illegible]

[illegible]

ಚಿತ್ರದುರ್ಗದ [illegible]

ಚಿತ್ರದುರ್ಗದ [illegible]

Put-up with the other papers + continue note

30/9/09

15

ಸಾಕ್ಷಿದಾರರು ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ಕೆಲಸದ ಮೇಲಿದ್ದ ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ನೌಕರರು ಅಂತ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರು ಸ್ವತಂತ್ರ ಸಾಕ್ಷಿದಾ

[illegible]

Dft as per order

G.R.S. 26]

File No. 584-08

Serial No

Diary No. of letter replied to

No. 1426 encl 1 Regd packet

M.7.584-08-09 Sent separately

General and Rev. Secretariat

( )

, the 190 .

To

The Dy Commr,
Chitaldrug Distt

Date of issue 8th Dec: 1909

Signed by Mr A. S. Iyer

Sir,

Adverting to Correspondence ending with your Letter no 131 Dy 23d September 1909 reporting on the alleged conversion of a public building on the Chitaldrug Hill into a private one by the Swamy of the Muragi Matt, I am directed to request you to send up a proper sketch drawn to scale, of the temple of Siddeswara Swamy together with the buildings in dispute and to furnish informn on the points noted below:—

over.

SUBJECT.

the so-called Gopura
Connected with the compound wall
of either the temple or the "Murge
matha" by any compound
wall touching it?
2) Who worships the idol in
Siddeswara temple? Does the
Pujari set up on behalf of
the temple, any claim to the
buildings in dispute? The
Pujari if not already examined,
as a witness, may be examined
now.
3) Has the Murugi Swamy
any interest in the temple and
4) Is the Sampige Tree in
the "Murugi matha" included
in the Village amarozi now
If not, since when has it
been excluded?

List of enclosures,

2. I am also to request
you to express with reasons,
opinion whether the
"building is a part
le or the matha.

Copied by

Examined by

MGCPD—20,000-19-12—04

G.R.S. 27]

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT

(Continuation Sheet draft form)

3) The favor of an early report is requested.

4) The vernacular records are hereunto returned for reference and re submn

I have etc

(Cr's order) — [illegible]

For Secretary

[illegible] 7.12.[illegible]

MGCPB—[illegible]

D 1840-10
190

From Mus 584-08-10
The Deputy Commissioner
Chitaldrug District

To
The Secretary to the Govt.
of H. H the Maharaja of Mysore
Muzrai Deptt
Bangalore

Dated 30th
Despatched 31st March 1910
Received

General No. 367
No.

Enclosure No. 1 file & Plan

Furnishing additional information called for in respect of the alleged conversion of a public building on the Chitaldrug Hill into a private one by the Swamy of Murgi Matt &c.

Refer 4.4.10
AY Please continue note

WY 2/4/10

No 367

Sm 1 file & Plan

Office of the Deputy Commissioner
Chitaldrug District
Dated, Chitaldrug, 30th March 1910
31st

From

M. Chengiah Chetty, Esquire, B.A,
Deputy Commissioner
Chitaldrug District.

To

C. S. Balasundaram Iyer, Esquire, B.A.,
Offg: Secretary to the Government of
His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore
Muzrai Branch
Bangalore.

Sir,

In acknowledging receipt of your letter No 1426/Muz 584-08-8 dated the 8th December 1909 re the alleged conversion of a public building on the Chitaldrug Hill into a private one by the Swamy of the Murgi Matt, I have the honor to forward, herewith a sketch showing the positions of Siddeswaraswamy temple, the pam (known as Murgi Matt)

and

and the Gopuram together with replies to the queries therein put. For ready reference the question and answer are put in juxta-position

(1) Is the So called Gopura] Connected with the Compound wall of Either the temple or the "Murugi Matt" by any Compound wall touching it?	The Gopura marked 6 in the enclosed sketch is far away from the Siddeswara Swamy temple (No 21) and Close to the Murugi Matt building (No 28), but is not enclosed by a Compound wall
	para 3
(2) Who worships the idol in Siddeswara~~swamy~~ temple? Does the Pujari set up on behalf of the temple any Claim to the building in dispute?	Siddeswara Swamy is worshipped by one Siddappa who deposes that the building in dispute exclusively belongs to the Murugi Matt and not to the temple
9S) The Pujari, if not already examined as a witness may	His statement* is herein enclosed for reference.

examined now.

Para 4

(3) Has the Murgi Swamy any interest in the temple?

The temple is a Muzrai institution enjoying a cash grant of Rs 4-8-0 per annum in the shape of Paditura Charges. The agent of the Murgi Matt who was examined on 11.3.10 States[x] that this temple among others at Chitaldrug is supervised by the Matt, and Santar-panes (feeding the Veera-Saiva devotees) are undertaken on all important festival occasions — such as Sravani, Navaratra Karthika, Ajugadi and Maha Sivaratri days) by the local Matadhikaries in connection with special worship observed on those occasions. His statement also is, herewith submitted

x Flag B)

(Para 5)

(5)

Flag 5)

Is the Sampige tree in the "Mwege Matta" included in the village Amarai now? If not, since when has it been excluded?

The Amildar reports that the records prior to 1901–1902 relating to the Amarai Sales have been destroyed and the available ones from 1901–1902 go to show that it has been included in the list of Amarai Sales held annually by the Taluk Authorities; but the agent of the Matt put in a petition to the Taluk Amildar on 4.4 1890 (Vide Exhibit E to the memo dated 23.9.09 drawn up by the Assistant Commissioner Chitaldrug Sub Division) Complaining that the Sampige tree standing within the Matt Compound was sold along with other trees in government lands. This petition was referred to the Shanbhogue for report (vide

Vide Order No 227 dated 3rd June 1890 discussed in paras 20 and 21 of the Said Memo, and nothing further seems to have been done in the matter.

Again, this year, the agent has presented a petition praying that the said Sampige tree should not be sold.

6. I inspected the building under dispute, and feel satisfied that the tree in question is situated within the precincts of the Math.

7 From the situation of the Gopura (marked No 6 in the sketch), it is clear that it does not form part the temple, nor does it appear to

my

my mind to belong to the Matt, as it does not face the Matt building I am however led to think that the (Uyyale No 5), the Garudastambhas — No 23(b) and (c) — and the Gopuram No 6 should have belonged to some temples which are not in existence now

8 The papers received with the letter under reply are, herewith, retransmitted

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your Most Obedient Servant

Deputy Commissioner
Chitaldrug District

G.R.S. 28.]

40
17-11-10

File No. 584-08
Serial No. 11.

Diary No. of letter replied to

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.
( )

, the 19

Date of issue

Signed by

READ—

Petitions regd nos D 1401 and D 1768 dated 22d April and 19th June 1909 from Gunda Bhatta and other Brahmin residents of Chitaldrug and Hanumanthappa and other Lingayet residents of Godabanahalli and other Villages complaining of the unauthorized conversion by the Murage Swamy of the public building in front of Sampige Siddeswara Temple on the Chitaldrug Hill into a mate building.

Correspondence ending

over

ORDER THEREON.—No.

SUBJECT.

GPB—5,000—7-5-09

Letter no 367 - Dy 30th
March 1910 from the Dy Commr,
Chitaldrug District, on the subject
Order thereon no

The Agent of the Murage
Mate in April 1909 applied
to the Dy Commr for permission
to hold Santapane in the
stone building adjoining
the Sampige Siddeswara Swamy
Temple on the Chitaldrug Hill.
He was led to seek permission
as the right of the mate
to this building was in question
and the Patel had in October 1907
reported that this building
and an upparige close by
was being unauthorizedly
repaired. The Agent requested
that as preparations had
advanced, permission
at once be given
enquiry about time
the usual course
ing been granted

the Swamy stopped in this building for about 3 days and when he left the building, it was locked by his servants.

2 The Brahmins of the place and also the Sadhu Lingayets of adjoining villages complained to Govt and the local authorities that the Murage Swamy with intent to make out a title to the building had newly set up a Gaddige there, and had locked the door of the building. They contended that the building was not a Mate but was a Musafirkhana built for the use of the public by Palegars. The Assistant Commr in charge of the Chitaldrug Sub Division Mr Dharmaraja chetty, held a detailed enquiry and recorded a finding to the effect that the building belonged to the Murage Mate. This view was concurred in by the offg. Dy. Commr Mr K. Srinivasa Rau and

MGCPB—30,000—5-1 05.

by the permanent Dy. Commr. Mr. M. Chengiah Chetty who, as contd for, ~~have~~ has submitted the records to Govt. ~~in obedience to a requisition~~

3. The ~~Brahmins~~ objections taken to the finding of the local officers ~~for the reasons specified below~~ are that

1. the Matha of the Lingayets was a separate building,

2. ~~The~~ that the building in dispute is known as Siddeshwara's Chavati (~~Sughsh~~) or [illegible]

3. The Gaddige ~~was~~ has been recently put up. that

4. there are no Linga Mudre tones (~~[illegible]~~) in this building, &

5. that all the witnesses for Brahmins ~~were~~ had not been examined.

4. On a perusal of the records, Govt. are of opinion that the ~~Brahmins have~~ petitioners have ~~no~~ good case. It is true that all the witnesses specified by them ~~Brahmins~~ have not been examined; but ~~among~~ it is doubtful ~~those examined are many~~ the testimony of the others, who are mostly strangers to the place would be of any value. There are ~~ectable persons who all that the building by the name of~~

not made out any

G.R.S. 27]

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(Continuation Sheet draft form.)

are witnesses of respectability on the other side to prove that the building was known as Muragi Matha and there is ~~un-~~ ~~unreachable~~ reliable documentary evidence to prove that the Muragi Svami has often exercised acts of ownership thereon. Under these Circs Govt resolve to uphold

~~Muragi Matt In face of this it is absurd for the Brahmins to contend that the Matt of the Lingayets was separate and that the building in dispute is known as Siddeswarachavadi or Kallukattada. Govt have no hesitation in upholding~~ the finding of the local officers that the building in dispute belongs to the Muragi Matt

5. As regards the Gopura or upparige refd. to in the Patel's report the Dy Commr who was asked to express an opinion says in his report no 367 Dt 30th March 1910 read above, that it forms part neither of the Siddeswara temple nor of the building in dispute and adds that it might have belonged to another temple. Govt ~~agree~~ accept ~~in~~ the Dy Commr's. View that the Gopura or upparige is not part of the building in dispute and that the Muragi Matt has no righ

– 6) 33

To it. They direct that this structure which is the property of Govt be held & treated as Govt property ~~for purposes of convenience~~ ~~tacked on to the Siddeswara Temple.~~

Submitted, may this order be printed?

AV 25410

Mr Macpherson

(as under)

For Secretary

To,

The Dy. Commr, Chitaldrug Distt. ~~returning the records Endt to the petrs~~

Copied by
[illegible]
18-11-10

D 1078

1907 5821-08-12

From
The Deputy Commissioner
Chitaldrug District

To
The Secretary to the Govt of Mysore
Revenue Department
Mazrai Branch
Bangalore

Dated
Despatched 15/12/10
Received

General No.
No.

Enclosure No.

Requesting return of the vernacular records relating to the Stone building near Sampagihddesvara temple on the Chitaldrug Hill.

GPB—75 reams—25 5 10

No. 230/34

Deputy Commissioner's Office,
Chitaldrug District
Dated Chitaldrug, 15th December 10

From

K. Chandy, Esquire, B.A.
Deputy Commissioner
Chitaldrug District.

To

C. P. Balasundaram Iyer, Esquire, B.A.
Offg. Secretary to the Government of His Highness
the Maharaja of Mysore
General & Revenue Departments
Mujrai Branch
Bangalore

Sir,

With reference to Government Order No. 1322/Mujr. J 584-08-11 dated the 19th November 1910 recognizing the ownership of the stone building near Sampige Siddeswaraswami temple on the Chitaldrug Hill, as one belonging to the Mungi Math, I have the honor to request that the Vernacular file of correspondence forwarded with this office letter No. 367 dated the 30th March 1910 may be kindly ordered to

to be returned early, as the Agent of the Mungi Math requests the return of the documents produced in support of its claim to the building in dispute.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your Most Obedient Servant

[signature]
for Deputy Commissioner
Chittagong District

P.S.

G R.S. 29A]

19

From

Secy to the Govt. of His Highness
The Maharaja of Mysore,
Genl and Rev. Dept

To

The Dy Commr
Chitaldrug Dist

Dated

Despatched

Received

General No
No.

Enclosure No. -13

one Office note (D-cs Office)
4 files Ver records
& 2 Registers

As requested in his letter no 230 dated 15th Decr 1910, has the honor to return the Vern records relating to the stone building near Sampige Siddeswara Swamy Temple on the Chitaldrug Hill

By order

2 Dec 1911

3/1/1911

Offg. Secretary

Copied by
Krishnamurthy.
6-1-4

GPB—20 000—24-10-10